DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 073 RC 007 456

AUTHOR Trueba, Henry T.
TITLE Bilingual Bicultural Education for Chicanos in the Southwest.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 13p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Biculturalism; *Bilingual Education; Cultural Background; Educational Philosophy; *Mexican Americans; *Program Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Southwest

ABSTRACT

The United States Office of Education defines bilingual bicultural (b/b) education as the use of 2 languages (one of which is English) in a well-organized program which would include the history and culture associated with the student's native language. In this paper, some Chicano perceptions of Southwestern b/b education are reviewed. Bilingual bicultural education is viewed in the framework of the Chicano's cultural experiences; the different educational philosophies reflected by Chicano educators; and the expectations of Chicano educators. Life histories of 15 Chicano teachers and their relatives and interviews with 40 of the 125 b/b teachers trained in the Mexican American Education Project at California State University (Sacramento) during the last 5 years were used. The topics discussed include: the sociocultural experience of the Chicano; types, scope, and impact of b/b education; the new b/b education program in the planning stage; the legitimacy and acceptability of b/b education; and unresolved problems of b/b education for Chicanos. The views of the teachers who participated in the Mexican American Education Project during 1971-73 are summarized. (NQ)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BILINGUAL BICULTURAL EDUCATION FOR CHICANOS IN THE SOUTHWEST

Henry T. Trueba, Ph.D.[1/]

ED 084073

This paper reviews some Chicano perceptions of bilingual bicultural (b/b) education in the southwest. The questions raised by such perceptions are: 1) In order to understand b/b education properly one has to look at it in the framework of the cultural experiences of the Chicanos. 2) Chicano experiences may be polarized and reflect different philosophies of education. 3) The evaluation of b/b programs should take into account the expectations of Chicano educators and see programmatic developments from their standpoint.

B/b education is understood by the United States Office of Education as the use of two languages, one of which is English, to instruct a group of students in a well-organized program which would include the history and culture associated with the student's native language. These programs are meant to emphasize equal proficiency in the two languages, but, according to Gaarder (1970: 163-178) the disparity between the aims and the means is enormous. The native language of the students is often seen as a mere bridge to be crossed and abandoned as soon as possible. In a recent article Kjolseth (1973: 15-24) presents a severe criticism of the existing bilingual programs in the United States, 80% of which, according to that author, are a manifestation and a triumph of American ethnocentrism and assimilation practices: 1) Programs are initiated by the school without community input. 2) The teacher is either a nonethnic, or an ethnic of different social and economic background, inactive in community affairs. 3) The teacher's attitudes towards the regional ethnic dialect are purist, viewing "interference" as a major problem and the use of regional idioms as "incorrect" (Kjolseth 1973: 11-13). Other scholars, such as Campbell (1973: 29-37) are tolerant of bilingual education but still postulate the complete immersion into the American culture as the only solution to the problems of minorities' education in the United States.

Dozier (1967: 389-402), Gumperz (1967: 48-57), Trueba (1973), Hymes (1967: 8-28), and Ornstein (1973: 321-339) among others have emphasized the sociocultural characteristics of the speech community and the need to understand bilingual education in its bicultural framework. In order to understand better this bicultural dimension of the bilingual programs I have interviewed 40 of the 125 b/b teachers trained in the Mexican American Education Project at California State University, Sacramento during the last five years. I also gathered 15 life histories of Chicano teachers and their relatives.

Introduction

By and large b/b education represents for the Chicano community the single most important effort to change the traditional educational philosophy expressed in standard policies and institutions throughout the country. B/b programs are thus seen by the Chicano educators as a major breakthrough in the ethnocentric rigidity of the overall school orientation towards a presumed monocultural middle-class American student. Chicanos also see b/b education as an opportunity to build up personal pride, self-identity, and a more meaningful and sensitive school system that recognizes the reality of our pluralistic American society. Finally, La Raza believes

RC 007456

1/ The author, a cultural anthropologist, now Associate Professor of Secondary Education at the University of Illinois, was born and raised in Mexico. He has been in the midst of the Mexican American communities since 1961; has served as instructor, research director, academic adviser and counselor in the Mexican American Education Project in the California State University at Sacramento from 1971 to 1973.

* Dept of Secondary Education
Urbana Illinois 61801

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

that b/b education ultimately will open the door to full Chicano participation in the socioeconomic opportunities that this country offers.

Two definitions are here in order: the definition of Chicano and the definition of b/b programs. "Chicano" has been, and still is, a controversial word. I used it here as synonymous with Mexican American, Hispano, La Raza, Mexican, etc. "Chicano" is a term that has been applied to "radical" Mexican Americans and, more recently, to all Mexican Americans. "Chicano" has been defined as "An American of Mexican descent who attempts through peaceful, reasonable, and responsible means to correct the image of the Mexican American and to improve the position of this minority in the American social structure" (Simmen 1972: 56). This definition, essentially correct, is, however, restrictive. I would define Chicano as "A person of Mexican descent, residing permanently in the United States, who perceives his culture as unique, that is, different from the Mexican and the Anglo cultures, and actively works to defend his cultural heritage and his social and civil rights, in order to improve his economic, political, social and religious life."

The second definition we must present at this point is that of b/b education. B/b education should be distinguished from remedial programs, from programs with English as a second language, and from bilingual programs which exclude the cultural component. The main purpose of the above programs is to facilitate the language change of the monolingual child, that is, from the native tongue of the child to the official language, English. In contrast with these programs, b/b education intends to train the child in two languages without his losing either one and to acquaint the child with a new culture without rejecting his own. The assumption is, contrary to what traditional remedial programs presupposed, that monocultural monolingual education is an undesirable goal. The goal of b/b education is to enrich the child's human experience with two compatible and alternative languages and cultures. Traditionally the American educational system has demanded that the culturally different child rapidly assimilate American culture and language conceived as a homogeneous unit. The result, of course, was that the child would gradually see his people, his language, his culture and himself as undesirable. He, therefore, would be psychologically damaged, divided and impaired in his learning and intellectual development. B/b programs see the minority child and the Anglo child as being in equal need for enlarging their cultural universe and perceiving each other as acceptable and equally good.

In order to appreciate the scope and types of b/b programs, their underlying philosophy and their significance for the Chicano, I must remind you of the facts of life Chicanos must confront, and of which they have become painfully aware.

1. Sociocultural Experience of the Chicano

The Chicano population, now the second largest minority in this country, is calculated to be of over five and one-half million persons of whom 90 percent live in the southwest representing at least 12 percent of the total population of this area.

The largest Chicano concentration is in the Southwest, where they trace their origins back to Autust 15, 1598, when Don Juan de Oñate arrived on the banks of the Rio Grande claiming that land for Spain. When Mexico lost Texas, New Mexico, Oregon, and much of California, Nevada, Utah, and Colorado to the United States in the War of 1846, the Mexican Americans living in that territory became subjects of the

United States and legal citizens. Although there had been a continuous flux of Mexicans since the last century, during the present century, especially between 1920 and 1929, and between 1955 and 1964, large numbers of Mexican migrants came to American as unskilled laborers. Second and third generation Latinos moved out of the fields and clustered in the large metropolis, such as Los Angeles, El Paso, and San Antonio. By 1960, over 80 percent of the Mexican Americans in the Southwest were urban dwellers (Steiner 1969: 142).

For many years Mexican Americans have been denied equal social status with Anglos and, still today, in some places they are discriminated against. Older Americans of Latin descent tell us how they were denied entrance to public parks, public swimming pools, movie theaters, stores, restaurants, and how they had segregated schools. At least the classic signs of the 1940s, "For Colored and Mexicans" have disappeared from restrooms, churches, and cemeteries, but after much bloodshed and tears. The Mexican American population in the United States is a very young one. The median age for Mexican Americans was 17 years in 1960. Their birth rate is the highest in the country. The education of the Mexican American is, by and large, very low. For example, in 1960, their median education for men and women 25 years old and over was 7.1 years of completed schooling as compared with 12.1 for the Anglo population. While Anglos have at least 22 percent with one year or more of college education, Chicanos have only six percent reaching that level of education.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Chicanos represent only three percent of the country's total population, 25 percent of all the G.I.'s in Vietnam were Chicanos. Although Latinos work, and work hard, in factories, mines, construction, and farms, etc., their income is low, for they have only 17 percent of their labor force in professional or clerical careers. To make it worse, their rate of unemployment is twice that of the nation's. More than half of the Mexican Americans employed earn less than the poverty level. In Texas the median family's income for the Spanish-speaking person is under $3,000 a year. In the Southwest, at best, 35 percent of all Chicanos have such a low income (1960 Census). Eighty percent of their homes are substandard; and in some south Texan counties, 40 percent of the homes have no indoor plumbing.

For those who are Latinos, or who have lived with the grass-roots Latinos in this country, there is no need to stress the fact that in many subtle ways, and sometimes in an overt and cruel manner, Latino children have suffered the psychological oppression of being humiliated, laughed at, neglected, or even despised and abused, not only by private individuals and groups of this society, but by the very authorities and institutions (schools included) that claim to represent the quintessence of American democracy.

2. Types, Scope, and Impact of B/B Education

It is rather astonishing that while a few years ago a Mexican American child was punished, at times even physically, in Texas for using his despised "Mex-Tex" dialect, we now reverse trends and encourage the Mexican child to use his native tongue and claim to profess respect for his Indian and Hispanic heritage and recognize his right to strengthen his cultural legacy. As in any other social change imposed upon traditional educational structures, bilingual bicultural education is trapped between opposite currents of either full support or cold war. There is a great deal of ambivalence on the part of administrators about the intrinsic value of this new educational ideology hidden under the vague term of "culture-based"

education. First I will discuss the development of bilingual programs, their objectives, as seen by Chicanos, and later I will elaborate on the conflicts, dilemmas and problems Chicanos must face in the process of organizing these programs.

There are over five million children eligible for bilingual education in the United States. While in 1969-70 there were only 76 such programs, which cost the government $7.5 million, in 1972-73 there were 213 bilingual programs which received 35 million dollars. The Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) has authorized 115 million dollars for the year 1973-74, and the appropriation requests are estimated to be over 41 million already. It is also significant that the programs for Spanish-speaking children represent 85 percent of the total number of programs in existence.

At present, there are two main types of b/b programs: (1) programs for children (either monolingual or quasibilingual) during the first years of school, from kindergarten to third of fourth grade and (2) programs for bilingual teachers (at the Mexican American level) to train these teachers in b/b education so they may effectively work with Chicanitos at all levels of education from elementary through high school, as teachers, counselors or administrators. What is essential to either of these types of programs is the emphasis on Chicano language and culture.

The scope of these programs is essentially the intellectual emancipation of the Chicano. Here are the main long-range objectives of the first type of b/b programs as expressed by Chicano educators:

1. To help Chicanitos maintain or create a positive self-image.

2. To provide cultural continuity for the Chicanitos as they move from their home environment to the Anglo institution of learning.

3. To develop and maintain pride in cultural heritage and build a more definite self-identity without losing the benefits of formal education.

4. To develop curricula on the basis of Chicano language and culture whereby the content and the means of communicating knowledge become relevant to the Chicano.

5. To stop and counteract school discrimination against Chicanos.

6. To upgrade the academic achievements of Chicanos.

7. To encourage Chicanos to fully participate in the national life of American society.

The goals of b/b programs of the second type, i.e., those geared to train teachers in b/b education, are complementary to the goals of the first type of programs:

1. To train teachers who can create the proper classroom atmosphere where the Chicanitos retain and develop a positive self-image.

2. To equip teachers with the knowledge of Chicano culture necessary to build pride in cultural heritage.

3. To train teachers as agents of change in their respective institutions, stimulating them to make innovations in educational methods, techniques and curricula.

4. To make teachers the models for Chicano incoming students who aspire to higher education.

It is rather difficult to measure the impact of teacher training in b/b programs on a short-time period. We have seen the graduates of the Mexican American Education Project in Sacramento earn important positions and obtain rapid improvements in the education of Mexican Americans. What I was concerned with, at the time of their training, was their concept of the program and its effect in their lives. Here are some of the results as concerns 39 M.A. graduates.

1. Regarding the impact of the program in the life of the participants, 75.6 percent feel that the project made a significant change in their careers because: (a) it has made them aware of their social responsibilities and personal capabilities, (b) it has given them the opportunity to obtain the M.A. degree, and it has helped them to orientate their education towards the Chicano community.

2. When asked about the program's capacity for producing innovative teachers, 91.9 percent of the participants replied that the program has offered them a unique opportunity to design educational techniques that will improve Chicano education.

3. Concerning the selection of students, 83.7 percent considered selection practices fair, and essentially based on the qualifications of candidates, i.e., high academic performance and strong commitment to improve Chicano education.

4. The aspirations of students go beyond the M.A. level. 29.7 percent plan to continue towards the Ph.D., and 43.2 percent see the project as an initial step in the increase of their own potentialities, though academically they are not inclined to continue for the Ph.D.

5. A majority of these Chicano students (54.1 percent) feel the need to visit as many local schools as possible to assess the situation of Chicano education, and to help Chicano students.

6. Most students, however, realize that their primary commitment during this year's training is to their academic work, especially through the use of the library (86.5 percent).

7. In spite of one emphasis on group solidarity, Chicano students feel personally responsible for the outcome of their school training (86.5 percent).

8. Chicano students manifest two main concerns with the regard to their academic performance: (a) The demands that course work and the M.A. thesis represent and (b) the lack of familiarity with proper academic behavior (75.7 percent).

9. The previous concerns are consistent with the three major challenges that many Chicanos (64.8 percent) face in school in order: (a) to adjust to the academic environment, especially when there is a conflict between school and community responsibilities (21.6 percent), (b) to have confidence in their own ability, experience and judgment (27.0 percent), and (c) to place themselves culturally, educationally and politically (16.2 percent).

10. When asked about the relevancy of curriculum, 97.3 percent of the participants answer that between 50 and 100 percent of the curriculum is directly applicable to their needs as teachers and administrators in schools with heavy Chicano population.

11. Nevertheless, some students (21.6 percent) would like to see curricular modifications, and other (35.1 percent) would welcome a cut in extra-curricular Chicano meetings, in their opinion unproductive.

12. Three out of four students had no serious economic problems during the year of training.

13. According to the project participants, the most important need of the Chicano community is: (a) educational upgrading via bilingual bicultural programs (48.6 percent), (b) political leadership and political power (21.6 percent), (c) solidarity of La Raza (10.8 percent,) (d) ideological leadership and more Ph.D.'s (2.7 percent), and (3) other (16.7 percent).

14. Given the opportunity, 43.2 percent of the students would like to replicate the program elsewhere, while others would see themselves directly involved in elementary or high school teaching of Chicanitos (40.5 percent).

15. The ideal job for the project participant would involve direct contact with as many Chicanos as possible, and offer opportunities for personal intellectual growth (67.5 percent).

16. The two most important targets of the students during training are: (a) to gain knowledge rapidly and (b) to show academic ability (67.5 percent). Other targets are the enjoyment of time to read, write, plan, and to make lasting friendships with other Chicanos.

17. Two-thirds of the participants (64.9 percent) were elementary school or high school teachers before joining the program, the remaining either were students or had other jobs than teaching.

18. During early childhood 2.7 percent learned English first, and later on learned Spanish (still as children). Nonetheless, the great majority (64.9 percent) learned Spanish first, and later on English. Only 18.7 percent of the students learned English exclusively during childhood. Finally 13.5 percent learned at the same time English and Spanish.

19. In spite of the previous findings, and although all project participants are to a degree bilinguals only 8.1 percent feel more fluent in Spanish than in English, and less than half of them (45.9 percent) feel they speak

English as well as the Anglos. Less than one-third of the participants (27.0 percent) think they speak English better than they do Spanish, and only 18.9 percent are aware of having a slight accent in English.

20. Regarding their present use of Spanish and English in the home, 48.6 percent use both English and Spanish, 29.7 percent use English exclusively, and 16.2 percent use Spanish exclusively.

3. New B/B Education Program in the Planning Stage

The general assumptions for all three types of b/b programs, the first two types now operating, and the third type in the planning stage, are still the same, from the standpoint of the Chicano educator, who sees formal education intimately related to informal education. To him, the ingredients of formal education are not only the instructional content of curricula, the methodology used to impart instruction, and the norms and regulations governing the behavior of teachers, administrators, students and other school personnel. Formal education is vitally related to the ideological atmosphere of the educational institution created in a given human and physical environment, and in the sociocultural milieu of peers and teachers, of parents and the surrounding community. The normal mental development of children, as well as their academic performance, depends a great deal on the conception they have formed of themselves, of the world around and of the educational institutions. Culturally different children who perceive themselves as members of an unwanted group, of a nonrespected culture, as less valuable than other children, are perforce afflicted by a series of psychological conflicts, by a lack of self-confidence, by a number of conflicting demands coming from either the dominant Anglo society or their own native community. For these children the acquisition of a second language (that of the dominant society) has numerous implications concerning other than linguistic behavior. In their view, for example, to speak English INSTEAD of Spanish (their original language) means to give up their own identity. This feeling is reinforced by the negative attitudes children perceive in teachers who oppose the use of other languages than English.

In principle, b/b education recognizes the legitimacy and respectability of other cultures and languages in the context of multicultural America. For the Chicano it is not only desirable and possible, but in fact, realistic and convenient to educate culturally different children by giving equal importance to their own language and culture, as well as to A DOMINANT LANGUAGE and A DOMINANT CULTURE of North America. B/b education does not destroy the nature culture of the minority child, and it does not condition academic success to compliance with middle-class verbal and nonverbal behavior. On a contrary, b/b education is built on the principle of respect for cultural integrity, and attempts to establish a balance between the impact of the Anglo-American culture and the native culture of the child. It is assumed, therefore, that a child may in fact learn two different codes of behavior (both linguistic and nonlinguistic behavior) and to manipulate two different cultural systems with reasonable success. We also defend that a b/b child is better prepared to grow intellectually and to meet the demands of the two conflicting worlds, his parents' world and the world of the dominant Anglo-American educational system.

These assumptions which are crucial to the very essence of b/b education need to be tested, to be investigated in situ, i.e., in the existing b/b programs. But

in order to design a fair test it is necessary to form a team of skillful and unbiased researchers. This is precisely the idea behind the third type of program, which is designed primarily for Latino students, that is, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans and other Latin Americans, who have already been involved in b/b education with Latino minorities in this country, and have obtained the M.A. either in education or in the social sciences. It consists of four semesters of intensive course work and two summers of field work research. It intends to provide an adequate interdisciplinary basis to investigate b/b education, and to capitalize on the wealth of experience of Latino Mexican American graduates presently involved in b/b education.

This program should combine the expertise of many specialists: b/b educators, curriculum specialists, psychologists, cultural anthropologists, linguists, early childhood researchers and Latin American regional scholars, among others The major thrust of this proposed doctoral program will be on the research methodology required to understand and evaluate existing b/b programs, to measure their impact for the mental development of Latino children, to make explicit their theoretical assumptions, and ascertain their assets and/or liabilities for the education of Latino minorities.

The long-range objectives of this doctoral program is to stimulate research on, and to increase understanding of, the nature and impact of current bilingual education in this country. Latino doctoral students should, in team with the Illinois specialists:

1. Generate appropriate research models in the area of second language acquisition and language interference in the bilingual setting.

2. Design adequate instruments for determining the kinds and degrees of bilingualism existing among Latino children.

3. Identify and measure the effects of b/b education for the emotional and mental development of the Latino child.

4. Develop adequate criteria for the evaluation of different b/b programs at various levels.

4. <u>Legitimacy and Acceptability of B/B Education</u>

It is obvious that the task of organizing any b/b program involves a number of innovations and departures from traditional academic behavior which creates discomfort in some, suspicion in others, and curiosity in still others. What are the real issues and contradictions involved in any attempt to develop a b/b program? How are these problems seen by Chicano educators? What follows is an attempt to summarize the views of the experienced teachers who participated in the Mexican American Education Project during 1971-72 and 1972-73.

On December 8-10 of 1972, these same teachers organized a Conference on b/b education which was attended by representatives from the states of California, Texas, New Mexico, Oregon, Arizona, Texas, and Illinois. Nationally recognized Chicano leaders dialogued with program directors and students. I gathered, both from questionnaires and interviews, the following feelings of these Chicano educators, with reference to the problems extrinsic and intrinsic to the programs:

Extrinsic to the Programs

1. Lack of institutional support at all levels. B/b education is sometimes considered unpatriotic, politically radical, and wasteful. Unstable and meager funding reflects this lack of support.

2. Rigid educational views that curtail curricular flexibility and innovative teaching.

3. Political rivalry among Chicanos and competition for the same meager resources that divides community support.

4. Departmental and school structured divisions that curtail effective use of personal and material resources.

5. Traditional policies for distribution and use of funds on the part of federal, state or local agencies.

Intrinsic to the Programs

1. Lack of models of b/b education which could be replicated, and lack of information about existing programs.

2. Inadequate conceptualization and justification of particular methodologies, techniques and curricular innovations of the programs currently operating.

3. Lack of adequate personnel to staff programs, especially personnel proficient in the languages involved.

4. Lack of critical self-evaluation to assess the achievement of proposed goals, the effectiveness of the techniques used and the reorientation of the program.

5. Conflicting philosophies of education on the part of staff and participants.

Most Chicanos present at the Sacramento conference seemed to recognize that b/b programs have developed too fast in the last five years, and have not been able to reassess and coordinate their activities. Since cooperative action and coordination are somehow contingent upon the philosophy of education that underlies b/b programs, it is important, at this point, to discuss the two polar positions of Chicano educators.

One philosophy would insist on the institutionalization of Chicano programs, their incorporation into the existing institutions of learning with full status equal to any other educational program. By implication, the followers of this philosophy strive for incorporating the Chicano population into the mainstream of American society with rights and obligations equal to those of the Anglos. American society, nevertheless, is seen by these Chicano educators as a pluralistic society that has never been homogeneous and has ignored the educational needs of the minority students. Education would, in their opinion, open the door to social and economic opportunities for the Chicano students. The steps to be followed are: (1) legislative and financial support for the existing b/b programs, (2) increase in number of the rank-and-file professional academicians and educators who would be working with Chicano students, serving as models for Chicano students and acting

as middle men between the educational institutions and the students and (3) a gradual change from within the system of education to make it more tolerant of cultural differences and more responsive to the needs of Chicanos.

The advocates of another philosophy, the "out-of-the-system" philosophy, do not want to infiltrate the American educational system which they consider rotten and crumbling. They want an entirely different structure, independent from the Anglo system, with its own goals, its own rules and one in which the control remains in the hands of Chicanos themselves. Since the main assumption is that the Anglo educational system cannot be patched or restored because it is collapsing already, this education philosophy stresses Chicano self-sufficiency, not competition with the Anglos; Chicano self-determination, not dependence on Anglo sources; Chicano creativeness, not imitation of the Anglos. They maximize meaningfulness of learning that comes from human experience and the values of Chicano culture. They emphasize "carnalismo" "brotherhood" of all Chicanos, whether they are students or faculty, and underemphasize ritual behavior between teacher and student. These are the major tenets of the "out-of-the-system" philosophy of education:

1. True learning is part of life, based on personal experience, therefore part of one's own culture, and involving all the human being, his intellect, his heart, his wishes, aspirations and values. Therefore learning must capitalize on the student's language, family structure, dietary and dressing patterns, religion and beliefs.

2. Learning must take place as an exchange of ideas between teacher and student, among students, in a symmetrical relationship, where the students' wishes, rights, and intellectual inputs, are respected by the teacher, and the flow of messages is balanced and meaningful. This symmetrical relationship would discourage the rigidity, dishonesty and incoherence of the instructor that are in the way of the student's intellectual growth.

As an example of this "out-of-the-system" philosophy, D.Q.U. (Dewanahwidah-Quetzaltcaotl University) a Chicano-Indian university near Davis, California, has been mentioned by some Chicanos. To what extent this is a good example, I am not prepared to tell. But where we draw the line between <u>in</u> and <u>out</u> of the educational system constitutes a controversial issue not yet resolved. What is important here is to note the way in which some Chicanos perceive the Anglo educational system and their contribution to our understanding of that system.

5. <u>Unresolved Problems of B/B Education for Chicanos</u>

It seems that, regardless of the philosophical opposition within the Chicano groups, there is a unanimous support for b/b programs. This support is extended even to those programs that would somehow neglect the cultural and historical element associated with the use of the Spanish language. The explanation of this fact may be that b/b programs are viewed by all Chicanos as an opportunity to influence the traditional negligence of Anglo schools for Mexican American children, and as an instrument to consolidate the cultural self-awareness of the Mexican American community as a whole. But this position with respect to b/b programs of very diverse type and quality is still enigmatic vis-a-vis their Chicano perception of both regional standard forms of the Spanish language which I will discuss later. The fact that among the trainees at Sacramento only

8.1 percent felt more competent in Spanish than in English, and that as many as 64.9 percent of them were raised in exclusively Spanish speaking homes (with no early exposure to English) suggests that the trend from monolingualism in Spanish to monolingualism in English is still very strong among Chicanos. Consistent with this information is the fact that in all of the formal situations (classes, meetings, etc.) and in many of the informal situations (conversations, occasional encounters, etc.) English was used predominantly by all Chicanos, except but some terms of address ("carnal," of a Spanish version of the proper name, such as "Ricardo" instead of Richard) and some incidental expressions intercalated following a pattern: e.g. "Orale," "Vamonos," etc.

I would even go further to state that the use of English (or a dialect of English) and the lack of linguistic competence in speaking any of the dialectic or standard forms of Spanish was not seen as decreasing Chicano identity. When occasional conversations in Spanish developed, anybody would simply switch to English and confess he did not speak Spanish fluently. What is then the element that keeps La Raza together, if the Spanish language does not play a predominant role in Chicano interaction. One could affirm that it is a special form of English, and many other numerous sociocultural intangibles which are vaguely referred to as "the Chicano experience." This experience would focus on similar early socialization patterns, family life and values, educational aspirations, solidarity in the face of similar oppression, emotional and psychological communication patterns and symbolic expressions, world view and conception of life, death, religion, friendship, love, self-identity and active involvement in community action, etc., etc. One could go on and on listing the intangible elements that escape quantitative measurements, and still find it difficult to draw the line between a Chicano marginally identified with the group and one that is at the very center of it. These very elements that draw together most Chicanos are at the same time the elements that separate one Chicano from another on the grounds that one does not have enough or has too much of a given characteristic.

The realization that Chicanismo is a dynamic process that stretches in a continuum from Mexican to almost Anglo American underlines the inherent problem of all b/b programs for Chicanos. In very few cases the Chicanitos belong to a homogeneous group from a single sociocultural and economic stratus, with equal linguistic skills in Spanish and/or English, with equal exposure and response to the Anglo culture, and therefore equally prepared to learn in a b/b program. The gap between the children of recent migrant workers and those of metropolitan skilled workers is enormous. But even differences between migrant families coming from Texas and those coming from northern Mexico are quite obvious.

There is another unresolved problem in b/b education in its purest form that postulates equal emphasis on the language and culture of Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans. If the long range goal is the maintenance of full linguistic skills in the home language and in English, what chances does a Mexican American child have to continue his education in Spanish after elementary or secondary levels? How soon will the child be forced to become monolingual in English, given the fact that the higher he goes in educational achievement the less Spanish he will use in the classroom, textbooks, in formal and informal communication with peers and instructors.

The answers to these questions fall outside of the scope of this paper

but they don't seem to undermine the significance and urgency of b/b education, nor the enthusiasm of the Chicano educators.

Chicano b/b education is beginning to stand on its own feet, struggling between two opposite philosophies, but strong enough to become for the Chicano community a symbol of intellectual freedom and a promise of a better future. B/b education, in the view of the Chicano staff and participants, goes beyond a fair share of the good things of life in American society: It means social recognition, respect and self-determination. If Chicanos complain at times that there are more chiefs than Indians, on many other occasions chiefs and Indians iron out their differences and work cooperatively showing a true CARNALISMO and love for each other. Quietly the "within-the-system" programs grow and show their fruits, thus giving La Raza a new sense of confidence and optimism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Campbell, R. N.
1973 Bilingual Education for Mexican American Children in California. In Bilingualism in the Southwest, P. R. Turner, ed., Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 29-37.

Dozier, E. P.
1967 Linguistic Acculturation Studies in the Southwest. In Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics, Dell Hymes and W. E. Bittle, eds., Mouton, The Hague, pp. 389-402.

Gaarder, A. B.
1970 The First Seventy-Six Bilingual Education Projects, In Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, 21st Annual Round Table, Number 23, J. E. Alatis, ed., Georgetown University Press, Washington, D. C., pp. 163-178.

Gumperz, John J.
1967 On the Linguistic Makers of Bilingualism. In Problems of Bilingualism, John MacNamara, ed., Special Issue, Journal of Social Issues, 23(2): 48-57.

Kjolseth, Rolf
1973 Bilingual Education Programs in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism? In Bilingualism in the Southwest, P. R. Turner, ed., Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 3-27.

MacNamara, John
1967 "Bilingualism in the Modern World" Journal of Social Issues 23 (2): 1-7.

Ornstein, Jacob
1973 Toward an Inventory of Interdisciplinary Tasks in Research on United States Southwest Bilingualism/Biculturalism. In Bilingualism in the Southwest, P. R. Turner, ed., Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 321-339.

Simmen, Edward
1972 Pain and Promise: The Chicano Today. New York: New American Library.

Steiner, S.
1969 La Raza: The Mexican Americans. New York: Harper and Row.

Trueba, H. T.
1973 "Chicano Bilingual-Bicultural Education." Paper presented at the IXth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Chicago.

HTT:mjc
SE-859